

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending. Claims 1, 6 and 9-11 have been amended. No new matter has been presented.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kakimoto, U.S. Patent No. 6,775,688 and Ramaley, U.S. Patent No. 6,687,741. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The independent claims of this application have been amended to clarify the invention. According to claims 1, 6 and 9, when the first and second transmission mode are both designated, a mixed transmission mode is executed. In the mixed transmission mode, an e-mail is sent to the destination for the first mode and the file is sent to the file transfer server for the second mode. The e-mail sent to the destination for the first mode has a text string including address information of the file transfer server designated for the second mode, but no file is attached to the e-mail.

According to the claimed invention, the transmission method is unified in multi-destination delivery, making control easier and reducing the overall data processing time. In addition, because a file is not attached to the e-mail message, the network occupation rate and the burden on the mail server may be reduced. In other words, because the data processing time and the network occupation rate may be reduced, work efficiency in data transmission may be improved.

Kakimoto discloses an e-mail system which distributes data by selecting a distribution method which is suitable to the amount of data to be distributed. At col. 8, lines 9-17, Kakimoto discloses that reference number 47 denotes information related to the data distribution method. According to Kakimoto, the apparatus determines which distribution method to employ by referring to the information shown in Fig. 5, at element 47. Kakimoto fails to teach or suggest, however, "executing the mixed transmission mode when the destinations for the first and second transmission modes are included, wherein an e-mail message having a text string including address information of the file transfer server designated for the second mode is sent to the destination designated for the

first mode, where no file is attached to the e-mail and a file designated in the second mode is sent to the file transfer server.”

The Examiner admits that Kakimoto fails to teach or suggest replacing the first transmission mode with the second transmission when it is determined that the destinations include those for which the first transmission mode is designated as well as those for which the second transmission mode is designated. The Examiner asserts that this feature is taught by Ramaley and that it would have been obvious to modify Kakimoto in view of Ramaley to arrive at the claimed invention.

First, the Examiner appears to misunderstand what is being claimed. Applicant hopes that the foregoing amendments clarify the invention for the Examiner. The first transmission mode is not replace with the second transmission mode. Rather, if both the first and second transmission modes are designated in a multi-destination delivery, a mixed transmission mode of delivery will be used. Neither of the cited references teaches or suggests this feature.

Ramaley discloses that in response to an indication that a file is to be sent to a recipient, a determination is automatically made as to whether the file should be sent as a link, as an attachment, or as both a link and an attachment. As stated above, Ramaley fails to teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 6 and 9.

The remaining claims are allowable at least due to their respective dependencies. Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 325772027900.

Dated: February 21, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Deborah S. Gladstein

Registration No.: 43,636
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 760-7753